

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED]

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: SEP 23 2004

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]  
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to  
Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents  
have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry  
must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3) as a skilled worker. The director determined that the petitioner failed to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage out of its net income or net current assets.

On appeal, counsel merely stated that he would submit a brief and/or evidence to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) within 30 days and averred that the director erred by basing his decision solely on the net income of the petitioner. Counsel did not provide a specific reason or citation to legal authority, or provide additional evidentiary support, for his assertion that the director erred by basing his decision on the net income of the petitioner, but stated that a brief and evidence would be submitted within 30 days.<sup>1</sup>

Counsel dated the appeal September 11, 2003. As of this date, more than twelve months later, the AAO has received nothing further.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v), an appeal shall be summarily dismissed if the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

Counsel here has not specifically addressed the reasons stated for denial and has not provided any additional evidence. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The director evaluated the petitioner's net current assets in addition to the net income. In *K.C.P. Food Co., Inc. v. Sava*, 623 F. Supp. 1080 (S.D.N.Y. 1985), the court held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now CIS, had properly relied on the petitioner's net income figure, as stated on the petitioner's corporate income tax returns.